



10-24-05

152613

Attn: P. Zimerman, Art Unit 2613
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

October 17, 2005

Dear P. Zimmerman:

This communication is in regard to Patent Application Serial No. 10/006,444 entitled "Optimizations for Live Event, Real-time, 3D Object Tracking."

In response to your Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated September 16, 2005, please find my enclosed redrafting of my Supplemental Amendment to the examiner along with the properly amended claims. Specifically, I have separated the claims onto their own document entitled "New Claims" which is referenced in the Supplemental Amendment. In this "New Claims" document, I first indicate that my original Claims 1 through 33 are cancelled and then I list Claims 34 through 49, each labeled as "(New)".

I thank you for your assistance in these matters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James A. Aman".

James A. Aman

This communication was mailed Post Office To Addressee from Harleysville, Pennsylvania on 10/17/05 using label 600655092.



Attn: Mr. Behrooz Senfi, Art Unit 2613
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

September 16, 2005

Dear Mr. Senfi:

This communication is in regard to Patent Application Serial No. 10/006,444 entitled "Optimizations for Live Event, Real-time, 3D Object Tracking."

In further response to both your Office Action dated March 11, 2005, and my interview at your offices on August 9th, please accept this supplemental amendment in which I provide additional arguments for your consideration, beyond those of my letter dated August 7th, 2005, as to why I believe Jain et al does not disclose my invention as either specified or claimed.

Also, please cancel my original Claims 1 through 33 and add new Claims 34 through 49 as specified in the attached document entitled "New Claims."

As a basis for my additional arguments amending those presented both in my letter dated August 7th and on my visit on August 9th, I would like to provide the following summary:

1. My patent teaches a configuration of a "second set" of "volume tracking cameras" responsive to a "first set" of "area tracking cameras." Jain only teaches of a single "set of volume tracking cameras."
2. My patent teaches that each camera in the "first set" of "area tracking cameras" should be aligned in a regular matrix with every other camera in that set, such that their individual fields-of-view are:
 - a. substantially perpendicular to the tracking area;
 - b. substantially parallel with each other, and
 - c. sufficiently overlapping to create a single contiguous, substantially coplanar view of the tracking area.
3. My patent teaches that the data from the "first" and "second" sets of cameras is combined to form a database comprising a multiplicity of 3-D coordinates for a multiplicity of key object features, such as body joints, etc., that requires minimal data storage and can be used to animate any desired 2-D viewing perspective. Jain teaches that the data from his "volume tracking cameras" is combined to form a database comprising 3-D video data that can be morphed into any desired 2-D viewing perspective.

In the next three sections of this amendment, I will take each of the preceding summarized points and provide:

1. References from my patent that specifically teach the summarized point;
2. References from Jain's patent that specifically teach his different approach,
 - a. Comments emphasizing and contrasting the differences, and
3. A recap of the summarized point in light of the references just provided.